UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

NICHOLAS E. PURPURA, Plaintiff, v. GOVERNOR CHRIS CHRISTIE, et al., Defendants.	Civil Action No. 15-3534 (MAS) (DEA) **ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on several motions. Pro se Plaintiff Nicholas E. Purpura ("Plaintiff") moves for entry of judgment by default against Defendants Governor Chris Christie, Senate President Steven M. Sweeney, Assembly Speaker Vincent Prieto, Attorney General John J. Hoffman, Joseph R. Fuentes, Judge Michael A. Donio, Judge Rudolph A. Filko, Judge Edward A. Jerejian, Judge Thomas V. Manaham, Judge Joseph W. Oxley, Judge Ronald Lee Reisner, Lorretta Weinberg, Senator Richard J. Codey, Annette Quijano, Peter J. Barnes, III, Reed Gusciora, Cleopatra G. Tucker, Gordon M. Johnson, Pamela R. Lampitt, John R. McKeon, Sean Kean, Robert Singer, Nia H. Gill, L. Grace Spencer, Shirley K. Turner, Patrick J. Diegnan, Mila M. Jasey, Tim Eustace, Gabriela M. Mosquera, Jason O'Donnell, Gary Schaer, Louis D. Greenwald, Charles Mainor, Valeria Vainieri Huttle, Herbert Conaway (collectively, the "State Defendants")[1]; Judge Leonard P. Stark (the "Federal Defendant"); and Judge Ruggero J. Aldisert ("Judge Aldisert"). (ECF No. 11.) The State Defendants and the Federal Defendant separately opposed the motion (ECF Nos. 13, 14), and Plaintiff replied (ECF Nos. 19, 20). Plaintiff also moves for summary judgment against Defendants Richard Cook and Achille Taglialatela

[1] Although Plaintiff did not name Defendant Bonnie Watson Coleman in his motion for entry of judgment by default, she also is a State Defendant named in the Complaint.

(collectively, the "Municipal Defendants"). (ECF No. 17.) The Municipal Defendants opposed the motion (ECF No. 30), and Plaintiff replied (ECF No. 32).

The State Defendants move to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1), (5), and (6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (ECF No. 25), and the Municipal Defendants join in the motion (ECF No. 37). Plaintiff filed opposition. (ECF No. 29.) The Federal Defendant also moves to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to Rule 4(m) and Rule 12(b)(1), (2), (5), and (6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 42.) Plaintiff filed opposition. (ECF No. 43.) The Court has carefully considered the parties' submissions and decides the matter without oral argument pursuant to Local Civil Rule 78.1. For the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion,

IT IS on this 31st day of March 2015, **ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff's motion for entry of judgment by default (ECF No. 11) is DENIED;
2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 17) is DENIED;
3. Defendants' motions to dismiss[2] (ECF Nos. 25, 42) are GRANTED;
4. Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice;
5. Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint by **April 29, 2016**, that complies with Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; and
6. If Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint by such date, the Complaint shall be dismissed with prejudice.

s/ Michael A. Shipp
MICHAEL A. SHIPP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

[2] As set forth in the Memorandum Opinion, because the Court's reasoning applies broadly to all Defendants, the motions to dismiss are granted as to all Defendants.